**SELF REVIEW and THE SELF REVIEWING CULTURE OF OUR SCHOOL**

This paper is an attempt to argue the case for FPER as a way of addressing Teaching as Inquiry. It is my contention that as the use of FPER gathers momentum, the whole school from the bottom to the top can call itself a SELF-REVIEWING school.

**THE MICRO LEVEL**

**PRTS – those training to get registration. The first level of self review**

These involve the observations that we are doing of teachers in the classroom. They are not designed to be top-down. Rather, they are designed to enable those being observed to reflect and review what has been observed. We do not warn them that we are coming. Simone or I will observe a class for about 20 min. It doesn't matter which 20 mins. We write our observations in two columns:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SEQUENCE OF THE LESSON** | **OBSERVATIONS** |
|  |  |

These are given to the teacher as the basis of a conversation between us. We want the teachers to write their own reflections on to the feedback sheet. They do this and then make the time to come and see us when we have a discussion.

It is this discussion that is the self review because we are immediately asking them how the 20 mins that we have observed fits into their lesson. We have made observations that stimulate thought and their reflection on their lesson. They own the reflection. So while I keep a copy I only use that as the basis for the next time that I observe that teacher. This model is a modification of Kevin Knight’s idea.

Put simply the **FOCUS** is the lesson and their opportunity to reflect, the **PROCESS** is the learning sequence in the observed section of the lesson and our observation and feedback, the **EVIDENCE** is all of what the students are doing to learn, what we observe in that section of the lesson and what the teacher takes from the lesson by way of self review. The **REVIEW** is either the teacher reviewing their lesson on their own or the meeting with Simone and/or myself.

This year we have taken this process to a different level by doing the same thing with the Mentor teachers and in my case with most of the Heads of Faculty. The idea here was that these ‘experts’ would have a stronger idea of how an observation encourages the culture of self review within their department . Later, it is my intention to do this with Heads of Department and ultimately teachers.

This is more than a walkthrough but less than a full observation. But it is self review. It has all of the components of **FOCUS, PROCESS, EVIDENCE, REVIEW**. It is contracted but the onus is on the teacher to reflect on their lesson.

This then is the basic building block of self review and demonstrated at a micro level. This process was started in 2011 but not refined until 2012.

**FPER to address the Registered Teacher criteria**

Provisionally registered teachers are required to provide evidence that they are meeting the RTCs. We ask them to manage the 12 RTCs by focusing on 2 per term using a FPER chart.

This simple method encourages reflective teaching and allows each PRT to: choose their own **‘Focus’** goals based on self-assessment against the criteria; plan the **‘Process’** they will undertake to develop in each area and the success criteria they will measure themselves against; list the **‘Evidence’** they have collected to show development; and **‘Review’** their progress against their predetermined success criteria. The PRTs have found this method very effective and efficient.

**Example of a FPER Chart addressing an RTC**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FOCUS** | **PROCESS** | **EVIDENCE** | **REVIEW** |
| **Criterion 1.**  establish and maintain effective professional relationships focused on the learning and well-being of ākong  i. engage in ethical, respectful, positive and collaborative professional relationships with:  • ākonga  • teaching colleagues, support staff and other professionals  • whānau and other carers of ākonga  • agencies, groups and individuals in the community | Lesson observations showing relationship between teacher and student  Consider students when planning lessons  Set up email group to communicate with class  Greet students at the door every day with a personal welcome | PD on classroom management and bullying notes  Lesson observations show interaction with class  Email contact with Deans and caregivers  Use of ‘Pam’s list’ in lesson planning. | Classroom management PD has helped to improve the effectiveness of my planning and control in classroom environment.  Have maintained positive contact with caregivers of students and colleagues.  Could improve on broadening my knowledge of students’ interests outside and inside of the classroom. |

**SELF REVIEW AS A TEACHER**

The model that I am supporting and promoting: **FOCUS, PROCESS, EVIDENCE, REVIEW** is flexible enough to be a record of what a teacher does ***after*** they have made changes and ***a plan looking ahead*** to the next cycle of learning. The template can start from any one of those FOUR headings eg you can start with **EVIDENCE** which as well as exam results, can include your own observations of your students, together with the **PROCESS**  that you went through last year, or last term, or last lesson, that led you to act . Or it can start with your last **REVIEW** as the place to start the next cycle. It is really a cycle. But if we keep on doing the same thing every year we will get the same results.

At Mt Albert Grammar moving the Self Review notion up a cog it can apply to any aspect of what we do. I will use the example based on interviews with Jenny Jagiello and Robina Nisha who led the Scholarship Biology programme

**Scholarship Biology**

**Below is a commentary of Focusing and using Evidence to generate a Process**

The issue was that students had previously been accelerated but it was not directed, it was not going anywhere– it was credit accumulation. You need to make what you do make sense for the students as you teach them. The ‘aha’ moments were not coming because the students were looking at things too discretely. We were not looking at Scholarship as a whole and how they interpreted Biology. The students who had been accelerated knew that they had to do such and such for this standard and something else for that standard, but not necessarily linking the ideas together. There is strong pressure from the students for the teacher to just give them the stuff and they would go off and learn it. But they would not make any connections. There is equally strong pressure from the students to just get what they need to know and that’s it. There is a lot of pressure from the kids to deliver in this way. The Scholarship kids came in last year and wanted to know where their notes were. But the teachers did not give them notes.

**Process**

Robina took them 3 times a week and Jenny took them once a week. What the teachers did was to give them the readings but guided them with templates to help them make their own notes. Linking all the concepts together and supporting each answer with justification(s) was the key. Templates were accessed that were used by the students to get them to make their own notes. Biology is a heavy literacy subject and while the key biological concepts and terms had to be there they also had to make connections correctly between those concepts in the context of a biological issue eg Evolution can be linked with several other concepts but under an over-arching idea.

They used seminars provided by the Liggins Institute to provide context for the concepts that were unpacked. They linked these to Scholarship questions. These were downloaded by Jenny and shown to the kids as part of the Scholarship sessions. They used Scholarships questions and practised the inferences that could be generated from the statements before they had actually fully read the question. Inference was a skill that was identified in the Literacy project as an area of weakness in the Junior years and it is exacerbated when kids say ‘just give us the notes’ Their minds were not closed off with this changed approach. They were generating absolutely everything that they could that might connect from the idea to answer that question. The brainstorming sessions pushed how far they could go to connect with an idea. The teachers felt that it was important that they did not expose them to the question too early because that narrowed down their thinking. They had a situation where Jenny was timetabled to go in to Robina’s class and work with the Schol kids so the lessons were differentiated. The curriculum underpinning the thinking was done by Robina and then the thinking was done with them by Jenny. There was a strong commitment by the students to the sessions and often they would come up with ideas that the teachers had not thought of. Creating an email group and keeping the students well informed was a key. Frequent feedback on the students’ answers was provided. Getting the students together for Biology Schol tutorials (pd 5 on Thursday) where they got into groups and brainstormed the answers and then had a week to write the answers. They emailed to teachers who marked them and gave them feedback. Extra opportunities for the students: research programmes, seminars, workshops (taking students to Hamilton for Bio Schol workshop last year) all added to the stimulus. Getting them involved with projects like Metagenomic from Massey. The top end students came along with answers or queries and we had intense discussion. Had a few Biology textbooks handy so easier to research and get answers.

The outcome in review was that Biology gained 13 Scholarships and 1 Outstanding Scholarship. The next steps for 2013 are to create a wikispace or possibly a Facebook page dedicated to Scholarship Biology. This will increase the informed discussion and dialogue between the students and the teachers. So they have taken what they did last year and added a layer to it for this year.

**Year 13 Scholarship Biology 2012 You are FPER used as a teaching as inquiry model (Blue is this year’s**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FOCUS** | **PROCESS** | **EVIDENCE** | **REVIEW** |
| * The focus was on improving the way that students engaged within the Scholarship sessions with the aim to increase the number of scholarships attained in Biology | * Combined approach by NHA and JGL * Moved away from discrete knowledge to integrated, knowledge that made connections * Used extension and differentiation with complimentary timetabling between NHA and JGL * Dedicated Schol sessions Thursday Pd 5 * Email groups to communicate to and fro. * Plans were put in place to provide them scaffolds so that they made their own notes rather than get given notes * Seminars downloaded and intensive discussion facilitated * Issues generated from the key idea before the questions were given to them | * Observation of the way that the accelerate students had previously learnt was acting as a hindrance to their ability to think abstractly and make connections * Previously Biology gained 6 Schols or so * This year (2012) they gained 13 Schols and 1 Outstanding * The evidence (while anecdotal) of engagement and the quality of the biological learning conversations was enhanced substantially * Feedback form students vindicates this | * The results (13 Schols and 1 Outstanding Schol) indicate that the model was a resounding success * This year the structure will be a bit different but the approach will be similar. * The intention is to build on what they did last year by improving the way that students interact with the ideas and concepts |

**Level** **L3 HISTORY**

In 2009 the Year 13 class was very small. At one stage it was debatable whether it would even run. But it did run with 13 students, with a solid core who engaged fully in the subject and others who engaged more as the year moved on. Those who did engage fully were Hayden Porter, John Pfluke, Olivia Taylor, Holly Dixon and Andrew Voerman. There will always be one or two, who while they were engaged in every lesson, did very little at home and did not bother with internal assessments and certainly exams. Oliver Neal was a case in point.

In 2010 (27 students), the class was quite different. While most did their work okay in class, there were about 10 who were a bit loose with their engagement. Of those 10, I think I convinced about seven that it was worthwhile to complete some work in class in order to improve their learning. Even those students who did not really engage in class still managed to achieve - sometimes with merit in the end of year exams. This was not what I wanted because I wanted far better results than that and was searching for the answer. I wanted more engagement with learning.

The 2011 experience was the low point. It was the year that I took the Year 11 class as well as the Year 13 class and I found it difficult to keep motivating the Year 13s – you only need a couple of ADHD students in your class to sap your energy. (But I did learn a lot about the re-alignment process in History which was one of the aims). The Year 13s results were fine when it came to assessments and their overall achievement was fine, but ironically their class work was very superficial and their reading was abysmal. They were not really engaging.

It was the scholarship group in 2011, in particular, that showed me how to get students engaged with the learning. We had the assessment specifications and we knew that it was going to be something to do with the nature of settler society. So it was down to the quality of the sessions that became important in preparing them for scholarship. They knew that they had to address five components each worth eight marks. Admittedly the fact that three out of the group of six were debaters helped. I did not teach five of them - they were in Mr Gardner's class but worked with them weekly. It was the contestable nature of history that was right up their alley – particularly Lucy Harrison. For the one student from my class (Tea Williams) he was on another planet as far as his engagement with learning in my class was concerned. The rest of my own class were not sharp and did not show enough commitment to their learning on a day to day basis.

So my FPER at the end of 2011 was to address this whole idea of engagement. I was keen to see if I could improve for 2012:

1. Scholarships
2. Endorsements at Excellence and Merit Level
3. Engagement with learning in the classroom and for homework
4. Find ways to promote feedback so that it did not stress the teacher out

So these were the FOCUS.

In 2012 things had to change as I reviewed the progress that I'd made in the teaching of year 13 History, so it was the perfect opportunity to try some of these things out.

My review told me that the students always prepared for externals with a very good spread of marks for internals. Dale and Paul Gardner and Christine Cato were all happy with the results. But I was not. The students performed well in the internals and in the final sprint to the exam but they did not always work particularly well in class. For example, if I set a reading activity they were very poor at getting started and did not have techniques to help them to recognise the key ideas quickly. Furthermore these were bright kids – kids who had succeeded at level 2 in order to gain entry to Level 3 History. They did not have good skills so I had to come up with a way that was going to get them to do more reading and to be accountable for it both in class and from homework.

It was Olivia Isbey who convinced me that the formative work was as important as the preparation for externals and internals. (She did not know that she had done this!) Whenever I set homework on a Thursday due the following Monday, she would finish it on the Friday and send it through to me. The depth of her understanding at the point of first teaching was crucial to her getting all Es in everything that she did. That was what she brought to every lesson and got me thinking and deciding to make the students more accountable daily to what was set by me.

So I started using 1B5 books to ‘talk’ to them. I bought the books (.20c each from The Warehouse) and distributed them 2/3 times per week. Sometimes I would pause the lesson after 20 minutes and get them to write down the 5 main ideas fro the first part of the lesson. I set up the cloak partners so that they could share their answers with someone else using ‘Give one Get one” and other strategies. On other occasions I would get them to write down questions that their partners would then answer – based on the lesson or based upon some reading. So it was not me telling them these pearls of wisdom. Rather, it was them engaging with each other ( feeding back) about their learning. I could always check their books later because they stayed with m

**13 History 2012 You are FPER used as a reflective tool**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FOCUS** | **PROCESS** | **EVIDENCE** | **REVIEW** |
| * Improving the ways that students access e-learning using the tools that students use themselves alongside my own preferred technology. * The outcome was to improve the pass rate of Excellence and Merit endorsements in the class over the previous year * To improve the formative feedback systems | * Text group set up for 13 History * Email group set up linked to text group * 13history wikispace added to regularly and links sent out * students to send essays by email * feedback systems and sharing using Clock partners * IB5 feedback book as the base formative device | * text messages from all 24 students * email messages from all * spiked usage of wikispace monitored and tracked * increased quantity of output from class * increase in feedback to class | * Increased number of Excellence and Merit Endorsements 2012 * 5 Excellence Endorsements, * 9 Merit Endorsements * Need now to take the strategies to another level – thinking about Achieved endorsements (14 credits as my pass mark in L3 History) * set up a 13 History Facebook page – talk to PUL who uses it for 11, 12 13 Chem account with strict protocols * Really push Formative assessment in a controlled window |

**Level 3 History 2013 FPER used as an action planning tool**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FOCUS** | **PROCESS** | **EVIDENCE** | **REVIEW** |
| * Increased number of Excellences and Merit Endorsements in 2013 * ‘Achieved’ endorsement target for those not getting E or M endorsement * Improve outcomes for Pasifika students * Push quality and quantity of Formative teaching and engagement with learning | * Try to use different feedback strategies using the clock partners * Closely monitor homework and reading exercises * Give lots of help for unpacking reading * Facebook for class * Evolve the peer feedback strategy using 1B4s * Read and apply Pasifika strategies * Interview every student | * Feedback from interviews * Feedback to each other as evidenced in 1B4s * IB4s used more creatively * Markbook tracking of homework * Predicted results in November * Results in January * Engagement index with all electronic tools; text group, email, wiki, facebook | * One done on November * Another in January |

**SELF REVIEW AS AN HOD or TIC of more than ONE CLASS**

***FPER used as an action planning tool for all classes in a subject ( Note this is not using NCEA assessments)***

This FPER table concentrates on formative teaching for the process using the evidence form the Biology example. The outcome is the improved number of M and Es and/or the improved achievement of Pasifika students but the process focuses on classroom practice.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FOCUS** | **PROCESS** | **EVIDENCE** | **REVIEW** |
| * Focus on all classes at one level * Improvement in the ratio of Excellence and Merit endorsements * Improve the achievement of Pasifika students | * Teachers of class meet to discuss common approaches based on class profiles * Student profiles created based on previous evidence * Sharing of strengths and weaknesses of students – needs teachers input * Strategies for improving engagement in class shared   amongst the group   * Professional readings shared where appropriate | * Student survey Term 1 and 3 * Selected eg Pasifika students interviewed Term 1 * Results collated and shared with the group * Improved quality and quantity of formative output in markbook | * Review at end of Term3 |

**SELF REVIEW AS A HEAD OF FACULTY**

As a Head of Faculty where you are responsible for several subjects there needs to be some way to rationalise the FPER table.

The HOF has an overview and needs to empower the HODs and subject leaders to operate their own FPER. However they will be part of one or two and leading possibly one.

I have a suggestion:

Have one table but several rows within it. So a Science table will have the following in one table: Year 9 science, Year 10 science, year 11 science, year 12 science, and year 13 science. This has the advantage of being a planning table that looks at a progression over several years and does not use a silo approach which would only be one year. This entails they Head of Faculty working with the level managers to make sure that they have the overview within their brief. In the case of Science the subjects might be derivative from General Science but the Physics and the Chemistry and the Biology starts at Y9.

Alternatively the HOF asks the HOD to keep them informed. This has the added advantage of encouraging real responsibility in your team.

***FPER used as a way to plan for improved outcomes for a subject within a Faculty***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FOCUS** | **PROCESS** | **EVIDENCE** | **REVIEW** |
| * . Focus on Y9 cohort and improving achievement | 2/3 lead teachers of a level meet to discuss common approaches based on class profiles   * Students identified and strategies shared with department | * Targeted students monitored and if necessary asked for observation feedback by a third party eg PPE * Class observed by each other * Class pre and post tests * Student voice feedback * Video of class being taught | * Review at end of Term 2 and 4 |
| * Focus on Y10 cohort |  |  |  |
| * Focus on Y11 cohort |  |  |  |
| * Focus on Y12 cohort |  |  |  |
| * Focus on Y13 cohort |  |  |  |

**THE PROFESSIONAL LEARNING GROUPS (PLGs)**

This year I have spent a lot of time getting staff to have a better understanding of what is meant by **PROCESS** and **EVIDENCE** in the model. The PLG model is only limiting where you are not sure about what you would like to do. The way to improve outcomes for students from what you as a teacher do, involves changing what you have previously done.

If you keep on doing the same thing and keep on getting the same results, who is the slow learner?

***FPER used as a way to structure a PLG***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FOCUS** | **PROCESS** | **EVIDENCE** | **REVIEW** |
| . Focus on a School Goal (Junior school) | * 4 teachers of a class meet to discuss common approaches based on class profile * Students identified and strategies shared | * Targeted students monitored and if necessary asked for observation feedback by a third party eg PPE * Class observed by each other * Class pre and post tests * Student voice * Video of class being taught | * Review at end of Term 2 and 4 |

**SELF REVIEW AS A STRATEGIC MANAGER**

This part is where ERO are particularly interested in the school’s ability to SELF REVIEW. If we consider FPER only to be concerned with teaching we narrow its use considerably.

If we think about any issue that good schools need to be thinking about to stay good we can use FPER for them as well.

Take any of the issues that members of SMT have looked at over the last few years:

* STREAMING
* BOYS VERSUS GIRLS EDUCATION
* THE JUNIOR SCHOOL
* STUDENT LEADERSHIP AND VOICE
* MAORI ACHIEVEMENT
* PASIFIKA ACHIEVEMENT
* LITERACY
* JUNIOR GRADUATION
* ASSESSMENT POLICIES
* POLICIES
* PROFESSIONAL LEARNING GROUPS
* SCHOLARSHIP
* MID YEAR EXAMS
* MIDDLE MANAGEMENT
* THE QUALITY ASSURANCE MANUAL

It does not matter what the issue is, the FPER model fits it. The rigour is from what you do after you initially diagnose the issue and comes from the process that you go through subsequently. The Biology example demonstrates this.

The FPER MODEL can start from any point across the headings or it can be a point in time review. So Bdn might say that he wants me to Self-review the Advice and Guidance process for beginning teachers. I can produce that review in about 3 days.

OR it can be an action plan before the next cycle. That is its strength.

It can involve:

* The thinking that you put into the focus - the quality of the questions that you ask – the way that you think about the issue.
* The rigour comes from the depth that you put into each part of the process eg a staff survey is not a self review in itself – it is one part of the process and one piece of evidence as part of the self review. The evidence that it provides needs to be triangulated against other evidence
* The strength of the evidence - the triangualation of evidence.
* The reflection on the issue that involves decisions to act (or not)

Teaching as Inquiry and reviewing what you do using this model is the first step to analyzing any issue. The second step is when you decide to change or modify a practice.

The strength of this model is that it works into any review to reflect on what you have done and acts as an action plan for future action.

I have attached the Teaching as Inquiry model as written in the Curriculum and aligned the FPER model to it.

I would be interested in any outside facilitator critiquing this model.

Kind regards

John Pipe

12 April 2013

